



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

WHAT CONSTITUTES A COLLEGE AND WHAT A SECONDARY SCHOOL.

RICHARD H. JESSE.

Great is the diversity in our secondary schools and colleges. This fact makes the subject assigned to me very difficult. The terms in which it is stated were prescribed. They restrict the question to what under present usage in this country constitutes a college and what a secondary school. In examining present conditions it is natural always to consider what features plainly are passing away, and what are developing. So far as possible I shall confine the question to the ten states represented in this association. What then in these states constitutes a college and what a secondary school?

If we go by names and accept labels it does not take much to constitute either. Some institutions that employ only one teacher in a rented building without library or apparatus claim to be high schools or academies; and some that have little besides the act of incorporation and a machine for the manufacture of degrees proclaim themselves to be colleges. An institution of higher learning was chartered in this country some years ago, and a board of trustees appointed. The board met, elected officers, conferred on each of its members the degree of LL.D., and adjourned sine die, never to reassemble again. About this interesting institution we may not now linger for the reason that it was not established in the territory of these ten states, and for the additional reason that it was not a college or secondary school but a university. While no institution known to me in the territory of the association has quite reached this standard some have made thereto a reasonable and hopeful approach.

We can scarcely study an animal or a plant without considering the enemies that prey upon it. So also with institutions of learning. One of the deadliest enemies of the honest

secondary school is the spurious college; and let me remark without offensive epithet that most of our universities, my own among the number, perhaps of necessity for the present, are doing much of their work in the college field; while many of them by low standards of admission to law and medicine are accepting students that should be in the secondary schools. All this is wrong and in the interest of fair dealing it should be remedied as soon as possible. It would be a Godsend to our secondary schools if the spurious colleges could be reduced in title or, where that proves impossible, strangled; and it is most unfortunate that so much work in our universities should be a duplication of what the colleges offer.

The secondary is older than the elementary school as at present organized, and older than either the college or the university. It antedates, indeed, by several centuries the oldest of the European universities. In the United States these schools are divided into public and private. The Commissioner of Education in his report for 1892-3 counts about 1400 of the private and of the public some 2800. It is surprising to find that according to his statistics these two classes of institutions, one of which is twice as numerous as the other, are almost equal to each other in property and material possessions. In attendance the difference is greater. To the private schools he assigns some 100,000 students and to the public 130,000. The chief aim of the private secondary school is to get students ready for college, its subordinate aim to fit them for life; while in the public high school the chief aim is to fit students for life and preparation for college is subordinate. It may be remarked in passing that the private schools, adapting themselves so far as possible to the colleges, have had little influence upon requirements for admission to the freshman class. On the other hand the public high schools, aiming primarily at preparation for life, have been and are still forcing the colleges to revise materially their entrance requirements. In this way the masses of the people are compelling our institutions of higher learning to greater breadth and liberality. May the process go on and by going gather strength. In the

East the chief dependence of the colleges is upon the private fitting schools and the endowed academies; in the West the state universities at least rely chiefly upon the public high schools.

To secure unquestioned recognition a secondary school should have at least these things:

1. Well arranged courses of study, the last four years of which are devoted chiefly to Latin, Greek, French, German, English, history, algebra, geometry, and science.

2. A sufficient number of well-trained teachers.

3. Sufficient equipment, consisting of a library, suitable rooms, and a laboratory or laboratories.

In many places music, drawing, manual training, bookkeeping, gymnastics, etc., are added. These are desirable additions, but provision for proper instruction in the nine subjects mentioned above is enough to establish a valid claim to the title of secondary school. A number of questions may reasonably be asked as to these essentials.

1. Is it necessary that the courses be always four years long? May they not be six or three years long? I would answer yes to both questions. Some private or church fitting schools give courses six years long, but they generally take boys at about ten years of age and give some studies of elementary grade. On the other hand some fairly good high schools have courses only three years long, but in such cases until proof of excellence is furnished the presumption is always against them. Some of them have been built up by adding to the elementary grades first one year, and then another, and then a third. In such cases the lengthening of the courses to four years is generally to be expected. These defective institutions might oftentimes be properly included in lists of specific secondary schools, but for their sakes the definition should not be cut down.

2. Is it essential that both Latin and Greek should be taught? May not one or even both of them be left out? and may not modern languages be omitted? Is it absolutely necessary to teach science? Some schools of respectable quality do not teach Greek. A few of unquestionable merit omit both Latin and

Greek. Many of them omit modern languages and some teach no science at all. But the question how much may be omitted without sacrifice of title is like the question how many limbs may be removed from a man without loss of life. Most of our universities in their lists of approved schools include some that have courses only three years long, and many that teach no Greek and many again that leave out modern languages; but most of these schools are struggling forward and will in a few years repair their temporary defects. With hundreds of high schools and academies that meet fully the essentials as stated above, and with a constant tendency towards this standard on the part of even the defective, I dare not set the definition lower. Chicago alone has fourteen high schools that more than meet the terms of the definition, and that have enrolled over 8000 pupils. For sufficient reasons we all know how to make exceptions to any rule or definition.

Many of our secondary schools teach political economy, and in the elementary grades civil government has become a characteristic. I would that in both subjects the instruction could be so broadened as to include something of social ethics. In my opinion it is highly important to teach carefully the duties of life that arise from its greater relations—such duties as come from the relations of parent and child, husband and wife, neighbor and neighbor, citizen and municipality, citizen and state, corporation and general public, etc. The state and its organization and our relations to it should be a part of a larger question. Minute inquiries into the foundation of ethics, and the basis of right and wrong might be avoided. I do not forget that in teaching punctuality, regularity, order, industry, good behavior, and the facing of recurring responsibilities our schools are already cultivating the very roots of morality. Nevertheless this invaluable training might receive a good supplement in the formal teaching of those duties that arise from the greater relations of life. It is a gratuitous assumption that children coming from households of limitation get unconsciously and intuitively proper conceptions of these duties.

As a result of personal experience let me plead for a larger use in our secondary schools of the library and laboratory, and for a wider reading of the masterpieces of English and American literature, with a minimum of talk on the part of the instructor. In my opinion the best teacher of literature is one whose head and heart are full of the subject and whose mouth is prone to silence. There is a tendency to launch small portions of literature upon a stream of teachers' talk. In the presence of the masterpieces of our literature the wisest and best of us should let our words be few. If facts about science be the aim, a textbook with a few experiments at the lecture counter far excels the laboratory, but the laboratory cultivates habits of mind that in the range of studies are of greater importance than any number of scientific facts. A library in charge of a librarian should be recognized as an essential part of every secondary school. The librarian should do nothing but keep the books and help the pupils in their investigations. The library is the laboratory and the librarian the laboratory assistant for work in language, literature and history.

By college I mean in this paper an institution for academic instruction based upon the secondary schools. To secure unquestioned recognition a college must have in my judgment at least these things: (1) Respectable requirements for entrance to the Freshman class; (2) courses of study well arranged, four years' long, and embracing Latin, Greek, French, German, English, mathematics, history, political economy, philosophy, physics, chemistry, and biology; (3) at least eight good instructors who devote their whole time to teaching in the Freshman or higher classes the subjects named above; (4) a good library and suitable buildings, including three laboratories well-equipped, at least for undergraduate work, in the sciences named above; (5) income enough to maintain well the instruction and the equipment.

Some questions may reasonably be asked.

1. Are eight teachers indispensable?
2. Would it not be possible to omit political economy, teach

history with the languages, and confine science to physics and chemistry?

3. Is a college to lose its title because it maintains a preparatory department?

4. How much endowment and income are necessary?

5. What are respectable requirements for admission?

6. May not other subjects be taught?

I have known good college work to be done with six professors, without political economy or biology, and with the teaching of history combined with that of the languages, but it was done with great exertion, and such instances should be counted only as exceptions.

In answer to questions three and four let me remark that in the state of New York the regents who control such matters will not license a college that supports a preparatory department or that has courses of study less than four years long or that owns less than \$500,000 worth of property;¹ in Michigan the requirement is \$50,000; in Ohio and Nebraska \$5000; and in other states, so far as I know, nothing at all is demanded in money or in guarantee. But in New York the cost of living and the expense of building are higher than they are in the West, while the rate of interest is lower. People in New York consider themselves lucky if they get 5 per cent. interest on a safe investment. The president of one of the best of our Missouri colleges told me recently that his trustees never invested a dollar at less than 8 per cent. In view of the higher rate of interest and the smaller cost of living and of building in the West, I am tempted to say that \$250,000 amounts to as much for the establishment and maintenance of a college in any one of our ten states as \$500,000 does in New York. If the sum be raised to \$300,000 I will go immediately into dogmatic assertion.

¹ The Regents of the state of New York, other conditions being fulfilled, license a college whose course is three years long, provided that it requires a four years' high school course for entrance, or a college that requires for entrance only three years in the high school, provided that its own course is four years long. In other words, they recognize seven years as constituting a good term of secondary and college education.

It should be remembered, however, that no minimum is safe. No institution can maintain itself that does not do more than meet minimum conditions. Even in determining the number of necessary teachers some margin should be left for the inevitable presence of the feeble minded. No minimum is continuously maintained anywhere. Recognition of it therefore must be temporary and provisional.

The absence of a preparatory department should be considered as characteristic of a genuine college, but it does not follow that the title should be denied to every institution that has such a department. There are exceptions to nearly all rules. In applying this one some note should be taken of the condition of secondary education in the adjacent territory. Where this division of education is well established as it is in New York with its 520 high schools and academies under the supervision of the regents we would all agree that the maintenance of a preparatory department should be taken as proof of low educational standards and views; but in places where secondary education is wretchedly organized, as it is in many parts of the West, the temporary maintenance of a preparatory department should not debar from recognition an institution that is doing real college work.

Question five, in reference to requirements for entrance, it is difficult to answer specifically. Indeed where there is such variety in the matter involved no answer is worth very much. Personally I lean to the Stanford system with some modifications. I would require for all courses three years of English, three of mathematics and two of history. Then I would arrange the other units to be offered in groups suitable for the A.B., the Ph.B., or the science course. I would take care also that the total amount offered should not be distributed over more than half a dozen different subjects. With these modifications I favor in general the Stanford system, which thus changed comes fairly close to that adopted by the University of Chicago. But this is merely a personal opinion.

For examinations conducted by people that have no personal

knowledge of the students I have little respect. Where no better way of admission to the Freshman class can be found such examinations are possibly necessary; but the people that can best measure the attainments of the student in knowledge and in power are his teachers in the secondary schools. I therefore believe that it is far better for the colleges to satisfy themselves respecting these schools and to accept without hesitation the judgment of such of them as can be safely approved. In some states the examination papers are written under the supervision of the teachers, but are read by strangers. This I hold to be an unfortunate method. The pupil ought to be examined by the people that have taught him, and that know him, and it is wise for the colleges when satisfied of the excellence of any school to accept its guarantee of its graduates. The Missouri University has created as a permanent part of its organization the office of Examiner of Schools. This gentleman receives his salary and traveling expenses from the university. We find it wonderfully stimulating to the schools themselves. This fact alone would make the service ultimately pay for itself very handsomely.

In determining what are proper requirements for admission to college the secondary schools, in my opinion, have a perfect right to be heard. It is hard to establish healthy sympathy and confidence until the colleges are willing to admit cheerfully this proposition and to act accordingly.

Iowa has, within the last two or three years, through her State Teachers' Association, done some valuable work in classifying her colleges and in fixing reasonable requirements for entrance. Stimulated by her example, the State Teachers' Association of Missouri has appointed a committee of nine members, of which I have the honor to be chairman, and to which my friend and colleague, Chancellor Chaplin, of Washington University, and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and six others belong. This committee is to report what, in our opinion, it takes to constitute a college, and what are reasonable demands for admission thereto, and to prepare such programmes of study for secondary schools as will lead

to closer union between them and the colleges of the state. This report will be made next June. There is reason to believe that it will be adopted by an overwhelming majority. There will be no attempt to classify the colleges. The only division attempted will be that between the real and the spurious. We have been much aided by what has been done in Iowa, and are ambitious enough to hope to improve upon it. A similar movement in every state would be productive of good. But instead of these local efforts it might be well for this association to appoint a commission of at least one member from each state to answer such questions as Iowa and Missouri have proposed.

May not the college do more than is outlined above? May it not teach astronomy and other sciences, and several languages not mentioned, and particularly may it not do graduate work? To all of these questions, except the last, I would unhesitatingly answer yes. As to graduate work, let me remark that there are at least two kinds, one general, leading in most places to a master's degree, and the other professional, leading to Ph.D., and other degrees in law, medicine, engineering, etc. No study in any department is graduate in character except it be based upon good academic training. In my opinion the colleges may reasonably offer graduate work, general in character, and rounding out education to an orb of greater diameter, but they should not attempt even in academic studies that which is professional. This should be left to the universities, in spite of the fact that they now occupy constantly and most unfortunately the whole college field.

The first two years in college are really secondary in character. I always think of the high school and academy as covering the lower secondary period and the Freshman and Sophomore year at college as covering the upper secondary period. Until so much at least of academic training has been received, higher education, in my opinion, does not really begin.

In the secondary period, and in at least the Freshman and Sophomore years of the college, not only are the studies almost identical, but the character of the teaching is the same. The

chief function of the instructor is to teach well what has been discovered and arranged, and thereby to form mind and character. Naturally such instructors would have fine opportunities for writing school and college text-books. Original research, while not denied them, is a subordinate end. With the real university professor, on the contrary, the chief aim should be to teach methods of original investigation, and to employ them in actual research. As the writer was educated under the elective system from the beginning to the end of his school life, and never saw a curriculum in operation until he was thirty years old, it goes without saying that he favors the elective system in secondary schools and in colleges. Experience, however, shows that some restrictions are wise, the liberty increasing and the restrictions diminishing as the student makes progress. If we are to enjoy the best results in the college, and also in the university, greater attention must be paid to the professional training of teachers for these institutions. Unfortunately pedagogy is revered chiefly in our elementary public schools. In our academies, colleges and universities such studies are regarded generally with indifference and sometimes with contempt, and it is not yet thoroughly recognized that there is really a science of education. As the colleges train masters for the secondary schools we cannot hope for order and sympathy and the best results throughout our educational system until some knowledge of the science of education and of the theory and art of teaching are required of every applicant for a position as teacher everywhere.

Finally, the general question arises whether each state should not exercise some supervision over its private and denominational schools and colleges. New York does this. It would be a blessing, I think, if every state had a board of education consisting of, let us say, the superintendent of public schools, the president of the state university, the president of one of the state normal schools, the superintendent in one of the larger cities, the principal of an endowed academy, the president of a denominational college, and the principal of one of the larger public high schools, said board to have power

to grant charters to colleges and academies, and to supervise those already incorporated, and to deprive them of their privileges and titles when they cease to deserve them. In 1893 the Board of Regents in the state of New York took their charters from several feeble colleges, and put two more on probation. This was good work for a single year.

The most interesting questions are those which pertain to the inner and higher life of secondary schools and colleges. These I have wholly neglected. Believing that thus I was meeting your wishes, I have confined my treatment of the subject to the external and formal side. Time rather than interest is wanting to speak of that spirit and life in school and college which alone make questions of outward classification, organization and management worthy of consideration.

The paper was discussed as follows :

PRINCIPAL E. W. COY, Cincinnati, O.

I concur fully with the gentleman who has just addressed you in his opening statement respecting the difficulty of defining a secondary school and what I have to say will relate especially to the secondary school rather than the college. We speak of childhood and youth and manhood, but I think it will be difficult for any of us to tell just where childhood ends and where youth begins and where youth ends and manhood begins. And so in the case of secondary education. The course of education may be compared better to the upward slope of an inclined plane than to progress by abrupt steps. There is no place along that inclined plane where you can draw a line and say elementary education ends here and secondary begins, or secondary education ends here and higher education begins. We look in vain to find anything like a definition of the secondary school. I think we have drawn the terms primary, secondary and superior or higher education from European sources. They hardly apply to our conditions and they hardly apply to European conditions, except as we pass from secondary to higher education. It seems to me that it is a matter not simply of the subjects studied, but that there is really a psychological basis the foundation of this distinction, that there is a difference not alone in the subject

but a vital difference in method between what is properly elementary education and what is properly secondary education and what is properly higher education. This term has been used somewhat carelessly in this country. I looked over some of the reports of our commissioner of education to see what he has said about secondary education, and I find in the report of 1880 that "secondary instruction is an expression of somewhat vague meaning in the United States, comprehending all instruction in other than elementary schools and that given in the collegiate departments of universities, colleges and professional schools." In the report of 1881 we find nearly the same language used. In the report of 1891-2 the commissioner says, "the exact place of the secondary school has not been definitely determined." Dr. Harris says, "this is the characteristic of primary or elementary instruction, that it must take the world of human learning in fragments and fail to see the inter-communication of things. The education in high schools and academies, which we call secondary education, begins to correct this inadequacy of elementary education; it begins to study processes; it begins to see how things and events are produced; it begins to study causes and productive forces."

I think that is about as far as we have gone up to this point in defining what a secondary school is. The same subject may belong both to the primary and to the secondary school. While geometry, for instance, is classed among secondary studies, there is a phase of geometry study that belongs in the primary school.

So with the sciences, so with history for instance. History is both a primary study and a secondary study and a study in the higher department. The learning of stories connected with history, the reading of biographies belong to elementary schools. What is the difference between this work of the elementary school and of the secondary school? It seems to me that the work of the primary school appeals primarily to the powers of observation, to the perceptive faculties to the memory, and to the imagination. We do not mean that the pupil does not begin to reason very early, but that the reason is appealed to very little in the elementary stage. When we come to the secondary school we present subjects in a different way and appeal to reason, judgment and the reflective powers and only in a secondary way to the perceptive powers. When we go higher than this, we have still a different kind of instruction and different method appealing to still different powers.

The paper has laid down very specifically the studies that seem to be desirable for the secondary schools. It may be interesting to compare those with the studies recommended by the Committee of Ten. The Committee of Ten recommends: (1) languages—Latin, Greek, English, German, French and locally, Spanish; (2) mathematics—algebra, geometry, trigonometry; (3) general history and the intensive study of special epochs; (4) natural history—including descriptive astronomy, meteorology, botany, zoölogy, physiology, geology and ethnology, most of which subjects may be conveniently grouped under the title of physical geography; and (5) physics and chemistry. The Committee of Ten assent to this list, both for what it includes and for what it excludes.

I have copied off the course of study in one of the great German secondary schools in order that we might also compare that with the report. It begins with boys of from nine to ten years of age and continues for nine years. This course begins with religion, German, Latin, Greek, French, Hebrew, English, Italian, history and geography, mathematics, physical and natural sciences, gymnastics, drawing, singing, writing. Those are about the subjects pursued ordinarily in the German gymnasium.

It seems to me that, while the requirement recommended by the paper is very excellent as a maximum, and many of our high schools can meet, I think, all of the requirements of that report, it might be well to suggest a minimum. There are many high schools in the country that cannot at all come up to the requirements of that report, and might it not be well to suggest what may be omitted and the school still be classed as a secondary school? I would suggest in the first place as sciences, for the secondary school, botany, zoölogy, physiology, physics and chemistry, and as a minimum course, Latin, English, history, algebra, geometry, botany or zoölogy and physics or chemistry. That will omit the modern languages. There are a great many respectable high schools doing good work that cannot teach French and German. Greek I dislike very much to drop, but you will find a large number of very respectable high schools that do not and cannot, under the present circumstances, teach Greek. I submit whether it would not be well, in addition to the full requirement of the paper, to fix also some minimum, so that teachers in a school that does this minimum of work, may be considered as teachers in secondary schools. I have retained one language, Latin. No pupil ought to go

from school without a knowledge of some language besides his own. Latin is the most desirable for those pupils to know.

One word in regard to the length of the high school course. I know of no good reason why the course of our high schools in our large cities, and perhaps outside, should not begin earlier than it does. I know that what is attempted as a substitute for that is to put part of the work that belongs to the high school in schools below the high school. In my judgment that does not meet the case. I should like to see the experiment tried of cutting the twelve years of our public school life through the elementary and the high school into two equal divisions. Let there be six years of elementary study and six years of high school or secondary school work. It is not well to put these advanced studies into the lower schools for two reasons. In the first place it is easier to get well equipped teachers for the high schools than to get well equipped teachers for the elementary schools. Teachers in the high school ought to have a college education. We do not recognize that fact in regard to the teachers in the lower schools. In the second place teachers who have spent their time mainly in this elementary instruction and have their faces turned in that direction, cannot easily adapt themselves to the changed method of instruction necessary in the secondary and more advanced schools. Those of us who have been connected with the large high schools know that the promotion of teachers from the lower grades into the high schools has many disadvantages. It takes a long time to change method, and I am confident that the best thing to do is to begin the high school work two years below where it now begins, and I believe it can be done.

PRESIDENT A. S. DRAPER, OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

Mr. President: It must have been in an hour of even unwonted weakness that I consented to participate in the discussion of this involved and technical question. It is not a field into which I would naturally have entered, for it is well known to the people who know anything of me that I lay no claim to special information touching the "technique" of education. After what we heard last evening, from very high authority, it would seem to be unfashionable to be an "expert." Indeed it seems to have become my mission in life to stand by the patient who is being treated by an "expert," as his next friend, and see that the dose is one which he can stand.

I do not suppose it was expected that anyone would present a definite answer to the question. President Jesse has come as near the impossible as anyone could be expected to do. That is doubtless owing to the fact that he hails from the great state of Missouri, of which we heard such wonderful things last night. I read President Jesse's paper with a great deal of interest before I came here, and I marked some passages for comment, but I find that he has eliminated them.

Generally speaking, I suppose it may be said that the mission of the elementary school is to train the child so that he may help himself, become self-supporting and be a safe citizen of the state; that the mission of the high school and college is to train the pupil so that he may reach out and take hold of the higher things of life, and exert an influence upon people and affairs about him, and that the great work of the university is to engage in original research and add to the amount of the world's information. I am, of course, well aware that these definitions are open to criticism, but, roughly speaking, I suppose they would hold good.

We cannot tell just where the high school course is to end and the college course commence. We all believe that they are continuous and ought to be uninterrupted, but the differing circumstances of different communities will have much to do with fixing the point where the high school course shall stop and the college course begin. That point will be advanced higher and still higher as communities grow in size and increase in knowledge, in culture, in means, and in all of the instrumentalities for educational development and progress. A high school in the city of Chicago, with several hundred pupils and twenty or thirty teachers, must necessarily be a very different institution from a high school in the southern part of the state of Illinois, with fifty or seventy-five pupils and three or four teachers. It is not for us to unduly commend the one or do anything that will discourage the other. Perhaps both may be equally deserving of commendation. It is for this association to do what it can to assist both.

No one is responsible for this condition of things. It is the inevitable result of natural conditions; and the college which meets the work of the more lowly high school, and does what it can to stimulate and encourage that institution, is none the less a college than the one whose fetich is advanced entrance requirements, but which commonly has a door somewhere through which anyone can

get into some department of the institution. If I am not right about this then it is only within very recent years that the great universities of the country came to be colleges at all.

In the course of the discussion this morning there has been reference to the work of the colleges and secondary schools in the New England and Middle States as compared with similar work here. There is a difference in this work in the different sections, in consequence of early differences in organization and purposes which are historic. The public high school in the East was organized with special reference to taking the students from the grammar schools and fitting them for the duties of life, and not with a view of preparing them for college, for the very good reason that the ground was already occupied by private fitting schools. Of course the logic of events has been against these private fitting schools and many of them have ceased to exist. All have ceased to occupy the relative position which they once did, and the public high schools have come to take their places as college preparatory schools. The public high school in the West never traveled over that road. From the beginning it was intended that it should not only prepare for life work, but fit for college as well. This fact has had a very important bearing upon the development of secondary school work in the East and in the West, and I am bound to say that in the end it will prove true that the advantage was with us in consequence of that fact.

I have heard with great pleasure the comments of the writer of the paper, and others, upon the relatively perfect school organization and the excellent work which is being done for secondary and higher education in the state of New York. It is my deliberate judgment that the state of New York exercises more authoritative direction over all branches of educational work and has a more perfect school organization than any other state in the Union; and it is needless for me to add that I think that healthy and rapid educational development is largely dependent upon these things.

This leads me to one other thought and with that I will be content. While probably it was not expected that there would be any very definite answer to the question under consideration, but rather that it should arouse thought, stir up intellectual energy, provoke discussion and provide the means for intellectual dissipation, still I think that one thing may be very definitely said. There is one step we might take, and take with confidence. By our plan of government

authoritative supervision of all educational matters is left to the several states. It was not given over to the general government at the time of the adoption of the constitution, and has never since been. It rests with the law-making powers of the states. It cannot be exercised by subdivision of the states except where the right to do so has been specially delegated by the state legislatures.

We recognize as a college any institution which has the authority to confer the time honored collegiate degrees. These degrees may well be made to form a common basis of operations and a bond of union between all branches of collegiate work throughout the state, or indeed throughout the world. It is entirely within the province of the law-making power of each state to give or to withhold from local institutions the right to confer these degrees, and thus to protect them from dishonor and establish the firm foundations of collegiate work. No power but the state can do this. They tell us that in Iowa the State Teachers' Association is engaged in determining what shall be the basis of collegiate work. It is a courageous undertaking, and they are worthy of all honor for undertaking it, but after they have come to a determination they are powerless to enforce their conclusions. The legislature of Iowa can, and probably will, do so for them. The legislature can say what institutions shall have authority to confer collegiate degrees, and the legislature can punish the officers of any institution which presumes to do so without its authority. It can punish any institution for using the name "college" or "university" without its sanction. It can determine what institutions within the state are of sufficient strength and character, which of them have courses of study sufficiently broad and have competent instructional forces to execute those courses of study so as to justify giving them the right to confer the time honored college degrees upon the satisfactory completion of the courses prescribed.

This work, of course, cannot be done by the politicians. It can be done by constituting state educational boards and officers, with adequate authority to act in the matter under the public eye and in the name of the state. Cannot we take a long step forward in the way of leading the North Central States to take this course? And shall we not thereby find a more speedy and conclusive answer to the question under consideration than can be found in any other way?

PRINCIPAL J. W. FORD, PILLSBURY ACADEMY:

I had the pleasure of reading President Jesse's paper about a week ago, and took just as much pleasure in hearing it read this morning. It is full and exhaustive, covering the whole subject, and asking just the questions which a listener would wish to ask, and also making clear answers to these questions.

There is little left for me to do but to retrace the ground, and enforce some things of which he spoke in a passing way. However, I want to add a little to what he said, emphasizing a few points. I may take exceptions to some views presented in the paper; but, for the most part, I am in hearty accord with President Jesse's presentation of the subject.

"What constitutes a college?" "What constitutes a secondary school?" It is a matter of common experience that these terms are not clearly defined, and we are in danger of using them as we read the labels upon the druggist's bottles and jars without actually knowing the properties of the contents.

I prefer to speak upon the second half of the subject: "What constitutes a secondary school?" The question becomes more definite and easier if we put it in another form: "What studies should be included in the work of the four years that immediately precede entrance to the institutions we call colleges, and what should be the methods of study and instruction?"

I believe myself that the course in such schools should be at least four years long. I believe every teacher of the secondary schools would be glad to have a four years' course. The fact is that we cannot do the work we are expected to do in three years. We are crowded in four years. I believe every secondary school should have a four years' course after the completion of English Grammar, Arithmetic, and United States History, except that United States History might be taken up for intensive study in the last part of the course. I am satisfied with the way the course is laid out by President Jesse. With reference to the teachers, it seems to me that this is a matter that will have to be touched in a gentle way. I think there is a cure for our poor teachers in secondary schools. I think it was President Angell who said that a teacher should at least have a higher training than that he was called upon to give. This means a great deal. I have felt that I never wanted men or women to teach under me who were not college graduates, and if they had enjoyed a university education, I

would prefer them. Why? Simply because a man should have been taught to investigate and discover in order to teach. It gives him a breadth of view which leads him to compare and interpret and also guide in a way that no other man can. I would not accept even a normal graduate as a teacher, unless he had had the right sort of teaching in connection with or prior to his normal training. Just add a year of pedagogy to some lower training and that does not make a teacher. He must have first the fact, and then he must have the scientific reason for the fact, and then he should have also, if possible, the method of discovery.

This is ideal. It ought to be carried out as far as possible, if we are to make secondary education truly scientific and properly preparatory for college education. The governments of the various states can regulate this matter. I believe they will have to do it. In the state of Minnesota something is being done in that direction which will, I believe, prove efficient.

As the writer of the paper suggested, there should be laboratories in every secondary school. In physics, in chemistry, and in botany the work should be partly laboratory work. I believe that in the secondary school there should always be a text-book in these subjects, even with excellent teachers. It seems to me that the student in the secondary school will perceive the facts more quickly, if he has the text-book as a basis than if he is given a mere outline. I have seen hopeless instances of the outline method, when it seemed that the class might have done well with any good book. In the subject of botany, a student in the secondary school should be required not only to pursue the work of the text-book but to prepare a herbarium with from thirty to fifty specimens carefully mounted. In chemistry it seems to me that the work ought to be largely laboratory work, after the method of college work. I know of no reason why it should not be so. In Pillsbury Academy, students make formal recitations one hour a day for two days in the week, and spend two hours a day in the laboratory the other three days.

In the study of history the student should be required to consult several authors upon the same subject, and should become familiar with the common sources of information by using them.

I would like to emphasize a reference made in the paper regarding the teaching of the ethics of the higher relations of life. Certainly the idea of right should be made familiar. The student should be required

to be honest in his work and to regard the rights of others. There might be a difference of opinion with regard to the basis of ethics. This need not be discussed. We must insist on doing right, because this does not injure others and because it will lead others not to injure us. In a word, put it upon a purely utilitarian basis, if need be, namely, that it pays. In the regular school work we cannot help teaching ethics. Punctuality, regular attention to duty, courtesy, all beget ethical habits and lead the boy to inquire after right in larger relations. We must not think that we can educate a boy's mind on Monday and Tuesday, his body on Wednesday and his conscience on Sunday. The brain and conscience must be educated together. We should be honest as teachers, and always give a boy's motive fair consideration. We should seek to make our boys honest in their athletic contests, even when their opponents are dishonest.

I think that a great deal can be done in secondary schools towards making our young people intelligent upon the questions of the day. Boys and girls begin to think early. A boy of twelve wants to know "What the Government is," and one still younger asks whether the Superintendent of Public Schools owns all the schoolhouses and pays the teachers.

I agree with President Jesse that in presenting specimens of fine English literature the teacher's words should be few; but I have always found it very helpful to present occasionally to the whole school, a brief statement of the salient features of current topics. Students ask where they can learn more, and so acquire, what we all most highly prize, the disposition to investigate. The opening of the Atlanta Exposition, the passage of the Anti-Prize-Fight Bill in Texas, the Monroe Doctrine have recently furnished me subjects for such statements.

I want to touch upon a differentiation of teaching in the secondary schools which President Jesse put into his manuscript, but omitted in reading. Wherever the state pays for secondary schools, it ought to put into them manual training. I think manual training ought to be put in because it is good economy for the state to put it in. I do not know as I would put it in as a substitute for every language. I would take out all the foreign languages except one from one course, and put in a certain amount of manual training. Because the state pays for it, the state ought to spend its money where the money will serve the state best. I have spent a good many years of my life trying to teach Latin.

I honor it and fully appreciate its disciplinary value, and yet for all of that I have dragged so many boys through four years of it who ought never to have begun, that my conscience troubles me at times. Here is a boy who can draw. He has a gift for it; he knows whether a thing is square when he looks at it. That boy ought to have a chance to work along his natural bent, because it will pay best; he will make a better man, he will respect himself more, and serve the community better. We have too many poor lawyers, poor physicians, who are abusing our bodies, too many poor teachers, who are abusing the minds of the young. The beginnings of education in secondary schools turn them towards the learned professions.

But contractors everywhere complain that they cannot find competent woodworkers, steam fitters, plumbers, decorators, and wood finishers. Not long ago an English journeyman, in any craft, must serve seven years' apprenticeship. This gave England skilled artisans. Many a boy would be saved from idleness and even from vagrancy and crime, if avenues to practical education were open to him in our secondary schools. I know that all this is contrary to accepted theories of secondary education, but may not further progress be possible? There is no such barrier to advancement, especially in scientific investigation, as a widely accepted theory.

I would put manual training into the secondary schools appointed by the state, and then I would have the student with practical bent go to a scientific school. I would not let him go to college at all.

How shall we raise the grade of the secondary school? The suggestion was made that we might do it by enriching the seventh and eighth grades. I believe it could be done. Our young people want to think and they do think, and they put things together more than we give them credit for sometimes; but I believe the colleges must set the standards. While we do not put everybody through a four years' course in Pillsbury Academy, it is because the state universities are glad to get them after a three years' course. I am at my wits' end to know what to do now because of this very thing. I believe also this, that in some way or other there should be a common standard adopted. We cannot satisfy all the colleges because their requirements differ. Gentlemen of the higher schools, if you come to an agreement, I am satisfied it will help the lower schools, and we will be able to please you better. One thing more; I believe you ought to do just as is done in Michigan. Appoint a committee to go abroad and see what the

lower schools are doing. If you will take account of the character of the teachers, general character of the work of the school, and put a premium upon it, and then if you will admit students mainly upon the recommendation of the principal or the faculty of the institution, I believe we will serve you of the higher schools better. We have all spoken chiefly for the lower schools this morning, and yet this is fitting; for if you are going to raise the standard of education you will have to put the jackscrews upon the bottom. I want to bear you witness this morning from twenty-one years' experience in the secondary school, you, gentlemen of the colleges, will have to set the standard or you will never get the secondary school up to it.

PRESIDENT C. A. SCHAEFFER, IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY.

I would like to say a few words on the subject of conferring degrees. I think if we take the animal by the horns we shall be able to accomplish something as the outcome of this paper and this discussion. If we could control or limit the degree conferring power in the states which we represent we would accomplish a vast amount. Unfortunately, the condition of affairs is a very loose one at the present time. In the state of Iowa, in accordance with the terms of the law "Any number of people may associate themselves and become incorporated for the establishment of seminaries of learning." "Corporations of an academical character are invested with authority to confer the degrees usually conferred by such institutions." In other words, three of the janitors at our university at an expense of the fee for recording may found a university of their own, and may confer degrees upon anybody. This ought not to be, but it will take a long time to make a change in the law, I fear, unless some of the other states will support us, and I do not think we are alone in this state of degradation. If all the states that are represented in this North Central Association will join together, and if this association will take a definite stand I believe that in a very short time a reform in this matter can be accomplished. That is the only point that I care to take up excepting one that was suggested by the remarks of the last speaker in regard to the State University of Minnesota taking pupils from the high schools at the end of the third year. There is something to be said on the other side. I know a young man at present in our Junior class who never was in a high school. He had entered an academy expecting to be admitted to the university the next year. But as it appeared that he

lacked less than one-half year's work of the entrance requirements his father appealed to me to use my influence to get him admitted even though under heavy conditions, urging that it would be far better for the boy to be under a strain than to be spending the whole year in doing less than half a year's work, with the risk of forming habits that might ruin him for life. The matter having been referred to a committee of the faculty it was decided to admit him. He is now in the Junior class, has made up all of his conditions, stands well in everything, and in some subjects attained the highest mark in his last term's examinations, and he will complete his four years' course before he is nineteen. This is not an isolated case. There are many boys who might be prepared to enter college at an earlier age, and I believe that one of the greatest benefits to be derived from this association will be that we shall sooner or later agree upon some methods by which it can be done.

At the close of the discussion of President Jesse's paper, the Association proceeded to the transaction of miscellaneous business.

President Rogers, Chairman of the Committee on Nomination, offered the following nominations for the officers of the Association for the year 1896-7.

President—Charles Kendall Adams, President of the University of Wisconsin.

Vice-Presidents—Ohio, Charles F. Thwing, President of Western Reserve University; Principal E. W. Coy, Hughes High School, Cincinnati.

Michigan—Delos Fall, Professor in Albion College; W. H. Butts, Principal of Michigan Military Academy.

Wisconsin—Edward D. Eaton, President of Beloit College; A. J. Volland, Principal of Racine High School.

Indiana—George S. Burroughs, President of Wabash College; J. F. Knight, Superintendent of Schools, Laporte.

Illinois—William R. Harper, President of The University of Chicago; J. H. Collins, Superintendent of Schools, Springfield.

Minnesota—David L. Kiehle, Professor in the University of Minnesota; James W. Ford, Principal of Pillsbury Academy.

Iowa—Charles A. Schaeffer, President of the University of Iowa; William H. Turnbull, Principal of the Sioux City High School.

Missouri—Richard H. Jesse, President of the University of Missouri.

John T. Buchanan, Principal of the Kansas City Central High School.

Secretary.—Frederick L. Bliss, Principal of the Detroit High School.

Treasurer.—George N. Carman, Director of Lewis Institute.

Executive Committee.—James B. Angell, President of the University of Michigan; William F. King, President of Cornell College; Newton C. Dougherty, Superintendent of Schools, Peoria; David K. Goss, Superintendent of Schools, Indianapolis.

It was moved by Principal Buchanan of Kansas City that the secretary be instructed to cast the ballot of the meeting for the candidates nominated by the committee. The motion was adopted and the nominees were declared elected.

President Draper, chairman of the committee on time and place of meeting, recommended that the invitation of President Thwing of Western Reserve University be accepted.

On motion, the report was adopted and Cleveland decided on as the place of meeting in 1897.

President Draper, in behalf of the same committee, reported the recommendation that two entire days be devoted to the next meeting of the Association.

Superintendent A. F. Nightingale moved that the matter be left to the discretion of the executive committee for the coming year. Adopted.

The treasurer here submitted his report, which was referred to an auditing committee, consisting of President Swain and Professor W. W. Beman.

The secretary in behalf of the executive committee offered the following nominations for election to membership:

Vice-President William L. Bryan, Indiana University; Professor Delos Fall, Albion College; President Carl Leo Mees,

Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute, Ind.; Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.

All were unanimously elected.

The secretary also reported for the executive committee that applications for membership in the Association had been received from Colorado.

On motion of Principal W. H. Butts of Michigan Military Academy, Colorado was added to the states included in the area of the Association, and the executive committee was requested to present, at the afternoon session, nominations for membership from this state.

The following resolution, offered by Dean C. H. Thurber, was adopted :

WHEREAS, There are now several Associations of Colleges and Preparatory Schools in this country with similar purposes and aims, and

WHEREAS, it is eminently desirable that these associations should be brought into intimate relations with one another in order that each may profit by the work of the others ;

Resolved, That this association appoint a committee to represent it at the meeting of the Department of Secondary and Higher Education of the National Educational Association at Buffalo in July next, and also that its secretary extend a request to the other similar associations of the country to send delegates to the same meeting for the purpose of perfecting, if possible, arrangements by which, in connection with the annual meeting of the National Educational Association, or at some other time, the various Associations of Colleges and Preparatory Schools may, through their representatives, hold an annual conference.

The following preamble and resolutions, offered by Superintendent A. F. Nightingale, were also adopted :

WHEREAS, The Secondary Department and the Department of Higher Education of the National Educational Association at the last meeting held in Denver in July 1895, appointed a committee of ten to take into consideration the whole question of College Entrance Requirements, with a view to bring about a nearer uniformity, and to report to the National Association, and

WHEREAS, This same question enters largely into the fundamental reasons for the organization of this and similar associations throughout the country, therefore

Resolved, That the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools expresses its appreciation of the importance attached to a solution of this problem, further

Resolved, That at the request of the executive officers of that committee, this Association appoint three of its members to act as a correspondence committee, and to render such assistance as they may be able, in furthering the efforts of this National Committee to bring about a better understanding between the Colleges and the Secondary Schools regarding the quality and quantity of work required in preparation for admission to our colleges.

It was moved by President Rogers that a committee, including one representative from each state in the Association, be appointed to report at the next annual meeting on possible legislation regulating the granting of academic degrees, President Angell to act as chairman, and President Draper to be second member of the committee. Adopted. President Harper moved that President Rogers be added to the committee, which motion was adopted.

President Harper then invited all delegates and members of the Association to take luncheon at his home at half past twelve.

The meeting then adjourned until half past two o'clock.

AFTERNOON SESSION, APRIL 4, 1896.

The meeting came to order at half-past two, with President Angell in the chair.

President Swain, chairman of the auditing committee, reported that the Treasurer's report was correct. The report of the committee was accepted.

The President announced the following committees. Committee on correspondence with the committee of the National Educational Association on College Entrance requirements, appointed in accordance with resolution of Superintendent Nightingale. President James H. Canfield, Ohio State University; Superintendent C. B. Gilbert, St. Paul; Principal W. H. Butts, Orchard Lake Military Academy.

Committee for conference with the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Middle States and Mary-

land, and the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Southern States appointed in accordance with the resolution of Dean C. H. Thurber: President John E. Bradley, Illinois College; Professor B. A. Hinsdale, University of Michigan; Professor William L. Bryan, Indiana State University; Dean C. H. Thurber, Morgan Park Academy; Principal Edward L. Harris, Cleveland Central High School; Principal William H. Smiley, Denver High School, Dist. No. 1.

Committee on Legislation, concerning granting of degrees, appointed in accordance with the resolution of President Rogers: President James B. Angell, University of Michigan; President Andrew S. Draper, University of Illinois; President Henry Wade Rogers, Northwestern University; Hon. E. E. White, Columbus; President James H. Smart, Purdue University; President George S. Albee, Oshkosh Normal School, Wisconsin; President Cyrus Northrup, University of Minnesota; President Charles A. Schaeffer, University of Iowa; Chancellor Winfield S. Chaplin, Washington University; Chancellor George E. MacLean, University of Nebraska; President F. H. Snow, University of Kansas; President James H. Baker, University of Colorado.

Following the appointment of the Committees were the exercises of the regular programme for the afternoon which took the form of a symposium. The following papers were presented: